1 2	Richard Heimann (CA State Bar # 063607) Nimish R. Desai (CA State Bar # 244953) LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP 275 Battery St., 29th Fl		
3	San Francisco, CA 94111-3339 Telephone: 415-956-1000		
4	Facsimile: 415-956-1008 rheimann@lchb.com		
5	ndesai@lchb.com		
6	David Stellings (pro hac vice)		
7	Katherine I. McBride (pro hac vice) Jessica A. Moldovan (pro hac vice)		
8	LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNS 250 Hudson Street, 8th Floor	TEIN, LLP	
9	New York, NY 10013 Telephone: 212.355.9500		
10	Facsimile: 212.355.9592 dstellings@lchb.com		
11	kmcbride@lchb.com jmoldovan@lchb.com		
12	Attorneys for Plaintiffs		
13	[Additional counsel listed on signature page]		
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
15	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
16			
17	JAMES MILSTEAD, et al.,	Case No. 4:21-cv-06338-JST	
18	Plaintiffs,	JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT	
19	v.		
20	GENERAL MOTORS LLC, et al.,	Date: May 2, 2025 Time: 1:30pm	
21	Defendants.	Judge: Hon. Jon S. Tigar	
22	Pursuant to the Court's scheduling order (ECF 264) the parties submit the following joint		
23	case management statement in advance of the case management conference scheduled for May 2,		
24			
25	I. Status of Discovery		
26	1. Status of Discovery		
27	require resolution by the Court at this time.		
28	require resolution by the court at this time.		

- 10
- 13
- 16
- 17

- 21
- 24
- 25
- 26 27

- 1. On April 8, 2025, the Court referred all discovery matters to the Honorable Magistrate Judge Thomas S. Hixon. ECF Nos. 265, 271. The parties continue to work to try to resolve or narrow any discovery disputes as they continue to prepare the case, including as follows:
- 2. Plaintiffs served their first set of Requests for Production (RFPs) on GM on November 22, 2023. GM served responses and objections on December 22, 2023. Plaintiffs have reviewed GM's productions in response to the first set of RFPs. The parties will continue to meet and confer about GM's responsive productions, as necessary.
- 3. Plaintiffs served their second set of RFPs on GM on March 18, 2024. GM served its responses on April 22, 2024. After reviewing GM's responses to the second set of RFPs, Plaintiffs served a subpoena on Aptiv, as discussed below. The parties will continue to meet and confer as necessary.
- 4. Plaintiffs served their third and fourth set of RFPs on GM on May 20, 2024. GM served their responses and objections to Plaintiffs' third set of RFPs on July 19, 2024, and their responses and objections to Plaintiffs' fourth set of RFPs on July 26, 2024. The parties will continue to meet and confer as necessary.
- 5. GM made rolling document productions on May 20 and 29, 2024, June 6 and 27, October 10, 2024, and most recently made a production on December 23, 2024; GM will continue to make productions on a rolling basis. To date, GM has produced over 1 million pages of documents responsive to Plaintiffs' RFPs, as well as two hard drives containing over 250 GB of technical data.
- GM has not yet commenced productions of emails or ESI from its custodial 6. collections in response to Plaintiffs' RFPs set three and four. On August 12, 2024, GM provided Plaintiffs with its initial list of ten proposed document custodians, and the parties commenced several months of negotiations, information exchanges, and proposals to work towards agreement on GM's document custodians. The parties ultimately reached agreement on 25 GM document custodians on March 27, 2025.

- 7. The parties anticipate further meet and confer efforts will be needed on GM's search term disclosures, which GM first provided to Plaintiffs on January 10, 2025. Plaintiffs responded with a counterproposal on February 19, 2025. GM ran hit reports on Plaintiffs' proposed search terms/strings and tested the number of documents that "hit" on particular terms. Because the parties were in the process of negotiating (and adding) document custodians, GM needed to load significant quantities of additional data to a review database, where it could test the search terms. Although GM continued to collect and process data through April, on April 17, 2025, GM responded to Plaintiffs' counterproposal with additional revisions. On April 25, 2025, Plaintiffs responded to GM with a further counterproposal and to request additional information regarding hit reports for GM's proposed search terms/strings and whether GM performed any sampling of non-hit documents (via control sets or random sampling) to determine whether responsive ESI was inadvertently being omitted, helping to improve recall. The parties will make best efforts to agree on GM's search terms or identify areas of disagreement by May 9, 2025.
- 8. Plaintiffs have raised with GM that they may seek to take a Rule 30(b)(6) deposition regarding corporate structure, ESI preservation, and data sources to identify relevant custodians, third parties, and learn about the manner and methods used by GM to store and maintain ESI. GM reserves all rights to oppose any such deposition. The parties will continue to meet and confer regarding custodial searches.
- 9. Plaintiffs served their first set of Interrogatories on GM on July 17, 2024. GM requested extensions on the response date, which Plaintiffs granted as a professional courtesy. During the extension period, GM requested, and plaintiffs agreed to meet and confer to address objections to the Interrogatories prior to service of responses and objections. Following those conferrals, GM served its responses and objections on September 13, 2024. The parties will continue to meet and confer as necessary, including for supplementation as discovery proceeds.
- 10. Plaintiffs served a subpoena to produce documents on third party Aptiv (formerly known as Delphi/Delco) on May 20, 2024. Plaintiffs and Aptiv negotiated and agreed to use model year 2012 as a test production to inform and narrow, where possible, the scope of future productions for all other model years. On August 9, 2024, Aptiv made its first production, which

Plaintiffs reviewed and used to inform their continued negotiations with Aptiv regarding the scope of materials to produce and the priority vehicle platforms. Aptiv thereafter commenced rolling productions for remaining model years (1999-2011, 2013-2018). Aptiv has made several rolling productions, including most recently on December 19, 2024. Plaintiffs are reviewing and assessing Aptiv's initial productions, including to inform the scope of subsequent productions in response to Plaintiffs' subpoena, and have raised the need for Aptiv to provide additional metadata in the existing production. Plaintiffs will continue to follow up with Aptiv on its subpoena response and the resulting productions received.

- 11. After reviewing Aptiv's production to Plaintiffs, GM separately served a subpoena on Aptiv. Despite GM's and Aptiv's good-faith efforts, they were unable to resolve disputes over the subpoena. On April 7, 2025, Apriv filed a motion for protective order. See ECF No. 267, as revised at ECF No. 270. On April 21, 2025, GM filed its response to Aptiv's motion. ECF Nos. 272, 273, 274. The hearing on Aptiv's motion is set for May 15, 2025 before Magistrate Judge Hixson. ECF No. 269.
- 12. GM served its first set of RFPs and Interrogatories as to each named Plaintiff on April 10, 2024. Plaintiffs served their responses and objections to the RFPs on May 10, 2024, and their responses and objections to the Interrogatories on May 24, 2024. The parties exchanged written correspondence regarding Plaintiffs' responses and objections and held a meet-and-confer call via video conference, where the parties resolved several disputes. Plaintiffs made their initial document production in response to GM's first set of RFPs on July 12, 2024, and have made subsequent productions on September 30, 2024, and March 28, 2025. To date, Plaintiffs have produced 86 documents totaling 421 pages. Plaintiffs will continue to make productions on a rolling basis.
- 13. Plaintiffs agreed to and did provide supplemental interrogatory responses reflecting the resolved disputes referenced above. Plaintiffs served supplemental responses on March 26 and March 28, 2025. GM continues to review Plaintiffs' supplemental responses and additional productions and will meet and confer with Plaintiffs as needed.

28

24

25

26

- 14. In connection with Plaintiffs' production, plaintiff James Milstead produced his vehicle purchase agreement, which contained an arbitration clause. As asserted in GM's affirmative defenses to Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complaint, GM anticipates that many absent class members purchased their vehicles subject to sales contracts that contain arbitration clauses. See ECF 214 at 34 (GM. Aff. Defense No. 23). GM has advised Plaintiffs that based on the individualized circumstances of Mr. Milstead's purchase and the claims he asserts, it does not intend to move to compel him to arbitration based on his purchase agreement. GM's position is subject to change based on further developments during fact discovery or amendments to the pleadings, if any. GM further reserves its rights to raise arbitration issues in opposition to Plaintiffs' Class Certification Motion or in support of or in response to any other motion as appropriate. Plaintiffs are not presently aware of any valid grounds for arbitration of the claims in this litigation and reserve their rights to oppose any such defenses or attempts to compel arbitration when and if GM raises them.
- 15. The parties have conferred about their anticipated subjects of discovery in this matter. *See* ECF 216 at 6-7 (presenting the parties' positions on anticipated discovery).
- 16. GM anticipates serving additional discovery on and deposing the named Plaintiffs. GM served document subpoenas on Chris Caruso, and Sal Fariello. GM has received initial objections or responses from Mr. Caruso and Mr. Fariello and anticipates additional meet-and-confers to resolve disputes regarding same. GM anticipates seeking depositions after receiving any document productions. GM further anticipates serving discovery on and/or deposing certain third parties, including absent class members. Plaintiffs reserve their rights to object and move to quash or limit such third party discovery at the appropriate time.
- 17. Plaintiffs' Counsel, who represent Mr. Caruso in connection with responding to GM's document subpoena, agreed to accept service on Mr. Caruso's behalf. Plaintiffs' Counsel then served responses and objections for Mr. Caruso on March 24, 2025. Counsel will meet and confer as necessary on these responses. Plaintiffs separately reserve their rights to object and move to quash and/or limit GM's subpoena as to Mr. Caruso should it become necessary during the meet-confer process on Mr. Caruso's responses.

1 18. The parties have not otherwise discussed specific discovery that is not yet 2 propounded at this time. 3 II. **Other Issues** 4 19. The parties do not have other matters or disputes requiring the Court's attention at 5 this time. 6 Respectfully submitted, Dated: April 25, 2025 7 By: /s/ Roland Tellis 8 Roland Tellis (CA Bar #186269) 9 David Fernandes (CA Bar #280944) Adam Tamburelli (CA Bar #301902) 10 BARON & BUDD, P.C. 15910 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 1600 11 Encino, California 91436 Telephone: (818) 839-2333 12 Facsimile: (818)-986-9698 13 rtellis@baronbudd.com dfernandes@baronbudd.com 14 atamburelli@baronbudd.com 15 David Stellings (pro hac vice) Katherine I. McBride (pro hac vice) 16 Jessica A. Moldovan (pro hac vice) 17 LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP 18 250 Hudson Street, 8th Floor New York, NY 10013 19 Telephone: 212.355.9500 20 Facsimile: 212.355.9592 dstellings@lchb.com 21 kmcbride@lchb.com imoldovan@lchb.com 22 23 24 25 26 27

1	W. Daniel "Dee" Miles, III (pro hac vice)
2	H. Clay Barnett, III (pro hac vice)
2	J. Mitch Williams (pro hac vice)
3	Rebecca D. Gilliland (<i>pro hac vice</i>) Dylan T. Martin (<i>pro hac vice</i>)
4	BEASLEY, ALLEN, CROW,
_ ا	METHVIN, PORTIS & MILES, P.C.
5	272 Commerce Street
6	Montgomery, AL 36104 Telephone: (334) 269-2343
7	Dee.Miles@beasleyallen.com
	Clay.Barnett@beasleyallen.com
8	Mitch.Williams@beasleyallen.com
9	Rebecca.Gilliland@beasleyallen.com
	Dylan.Martin@beasleyallen.com
10	David M. Birka-White (CA Bar # 85721)
11	BIRKA-WHITE LAW OFFICES
12	178 E. Prospect Avenue
	Danville, CA 94526 Telephone: (925) 362-9999
13	dbw@birka-white.com
14	
15	James E. Cecchi (pro hac vice)
13	Caroline F. Bartlett (pro hac vice)
16	CARELLA, BYRNE, CECCHI, OLSTEIN, BRODY & AGNELLO, P.C.
17	5 Becker Farm Road
	Roseland, New Jersey 07068
18	Telephone: (973) 994-1700
19	Facsimile: (973) 994-1744 jcecchi@carellabyrne.com
20	cbartlett@carellabyrne.com
20	
21	Joseph H. Meltzer (pro hac vice)
22	Melissa L. Troutner (<i>pro hac vice</i>) KESSLER TOPAZ
	MELTZER & CHECK, LLP
23	280 King of Prussia Road
24	Radnor, PA 19087
25	Telephone: (610) 667-7706 Facsimile: (610) 667-7056
	jmeltzer@ktmc.com
26	mtroutner@ktmc.com
27	
28	
40	

1 ATTESTATION (CIVIL LOCAL RULE 5-1(i)(3)) 2 In accordance with Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I attest the concurrence in the filing of this 3 document has been obtained from the signatories. 4 Dated: April 25, 2025 /s/ Roland Tellis

Roland Tellis

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I HEREBY CERTIFY that on April 25, 2025, a true and correct copy of the foregoing was electronically filed and served electronically via the Court's CM/ECF system, which will automatically serve notice to all registered counsel of record. /s/ Roland Tellis Roland Tellis